1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK Case No. 08-13555 In the Matter of: LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS, INC., et al. Debtors. United States Bankruptcy Court One Bowling Green New York, New York September 19, 2008 4:36 PM BEFORE: HON. JAMES M. PECK U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

HEARING re Debtor's Motion for an Order Pursuant to Section 105 of the Bankruptcy Code Confirming Status of Citibank Clearing Advances HEARING re Debtor's Motion to (a) Schedule a Sale Hearing; (b) Establish Sales Procedures; (c) Approve a Breakup Fee; and (d) Approve the Sale of the Purchased Assets and the Assumption and Assignment of Contracts Relating to the Purchased Assets Transcribed by: Lisa Bar-Leib

45 if people have objections based upon that, they should be 1 somewhat relieved. 2 THE COURT: All right. And I'm sure if there are 3 questions during the break, they'll approach you or your 4 5 partners. 6 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: I think if a half hour is what you think 7 you need --8 9 MR. MILLER: Yes. THE COURT: -- why don't we say 5:15 with the 10 11 understanding that time has proven to be very flexible here in the past this week. And it may turn out that we'll need a 12 little bit more time. But let's make that the holding time and 13 if there's a need for more, somebody should just knock on my 14 chambers door and let me know what's required. 15 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay. We're adjourned until 5:15 17 provisionally. 18 (Recess from 4:43 p.m. until 5:41 p.m.) 19 THE COURT: Please be seated. I find myself in the 20 unusual position of being perhaps the only person in the 21 courtroom who doesn't know what everybody else knows because I 22 23 didn't hear what you told everybody. Do you want to tell me anything? 24 25 MR. MILLER: Somehow, Your Honor, we knew you were

going to ask that question. So --

THE COURT: I hate to be that predictable.

MR. MILLER: There is a document -- maybe it'd be better, Your Honor, if we do it orally.

THE COURT: Fine.

MR. MILLER: My partner, Ms. Fife, will do that. And with some assistance from Ms. --

and this is purely technical. During the first phase of the hearing, I was told that those people who are listening in spillover courtrooms had a very hard time hearing me. I'm having some difficulty as compared with our last hearing with the amplification coming out of the podium. And I just want to make sure that we're not suffering system overload. Okay. That's on. And let me also make the announcement, whenever anyone speaks for the record, this is always true here, but given the number of people, please identify yourself before speaking.

MS. FIFE: Thank you, Your Honor. Lori Fife from Weil Gotshal & Manges on behalf of the debtors. Let me try to summarize the changes that were made to the transaction. In terms of the economic changes, they result largely because of the markets, unfortunately. And from the time that the transaction was actually entered into till now, the markets dropped and the value of the securities dropped as well.

So, originally, we were selling assets that had a value of seventy -- approximately seventy billion dollars. And today, Your Honor, we're only selling assets that have a value of 47.4 billion dollars.

Barclays is assuming liabilities, however, of 45.5 billion dollars in connection with those assets. So that has not changed from the original transaction. There was an upside sharing in the original transaction. There was going to be a true-up twelve months later on and that has been eliminated from this transaction.

Barclays is still agreeing to pay the cure amounts on any leases that it assumes or that we assume and assign to it.

Barclays is also agreeing to the same employee compensation arrangements. And it is also agreeing to pay the 250 million dollars of goodwill to LBI.

With respect to the real estate assets, Your Honor, that was -- we had said at the last hearing, I believe, it was approximately a billion dollars. Since that time, an appraisal has come in and it is below that amount. The contact had a provision which allowed the purchaser really to purchase the building at the appraised amount. So we have some negotiations to go, but I believe that the purchase price will come down by approximately a hundred million dollars.

There were two other real estate properties also which we received appraisals for which, similarly, were lower

than we had anticipated, unfortunately. So I think, cumulatively, we're expecting that the purchase price will come down by a hundred to maybe 200 million dollars for the real estate.

Some other changes that were made to the contracts affect what are called purchase assets and what are excluded assets. There was some confusion as to which subsidiaries, if any, were being sold. And we've clarified in a clarification letter which we're hoping to finalize and actually present to Your Honor whenever it comes down here. But in that letter, we're going to clarify that the only subsidiaries that are being purchased by Barclays are Lehman Brothers Canada Inc., Lehman Brothers Sudamerica SA and Lehman Brothers Uruguay SA. The latter two subsidiaries that I just referred to relate to a business that is called PIM, or Private Investment Management Business, which is a business that was not part of the original deal but is now being purchased by Barclays.

THE COURT: For no additional consideration?

MS. FIFE: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And what's that business worth?

MS. FIFE: It's essentially just people, Your Honor.

It's the high net worth individual brokerage business. And it's really just the people who are in those offices.

THE COURT: And their rolodexes.

MS. FIFE: And their rolodexes, exactly. The

customer accounts were being transferred anyway.

There was a change that was made to the license of the Lehman Brothers' name. It was perpetual. It is now two years but we don't really believe that that's a problem. The IMD business, which is essentially Neuberger Berman and some other related entities, will have a perpetual license to use the name.

There was a provision in the old agreement pursuant to which the parties were sharing the residential real estate mortgages. There is no longer that provision. Barclays was required to post collateral, actually this morning, in order to get DTC to open up trading. And that collateral was posted -- the residential real estate mortgages was posted to DTC. Pursuant to this transaction, Barclays is taking over and guaranteeing all of those transactions. And they are assuming the risk related to those transactions so that collateral will remain with Barclays.

THE COURT: What's the aggregate value of the posted collateral?

MS. FIFE: One second, Your Honor.

(Pause)

MS. FIFE: Your Honor, I'm not -- excuse me? There are 300,000 trades but we're not sure the value of the collateral. Perhaps during the rest of the hearing we can find that amount out for Your Honor.

51 transaction's not consummated then the transactions -- all the 1 trades come back to Lehman, and Lehman is then responsible for 2 them. Excuse me for one second, Your Honor. 3 (Pause) 4 MS. FIFE: I'm being told that if the liabilities are 5 less than the collateral then the excess collateral comes back 6 7 to Lehman. THE COURT: And if the liabilities are greater? 8 9 MS. FIFE: We have no further obligation. THE COURT: Okay. 10 MS. FIFE: We also modified the agreement -- would 11 you like the representative from DTC to explain that in more 12 13 detail, Your Honor? THE COURT: Mr. Hirshon, I'd be happy to hear from 14 15 you. MR. HIRSHON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Nice to be 16 before you. Sheldon Hirshon, Proskauer Rose, representing the 17 composite -- the trust clearing corporations. Your Honor, the 18 essence of the transaction is to move all of the accounts 19 seamlessly from Lehman to Barclays. What DTC does is the 20 plumbing of that and handles all of the details in the settling 21 of the trades. 22 THE COURT: Is that how they describe themselves? 23 MR. HIRSHON: That's how I describe them because 24 25 until Sunday, I didn't understand any of this. But it is what

spigots get turned on and off and how the pipeline is filled and then emptied. So each day -- there are several different clearinghouses. And each day the trades are matches and then either a net number goes to Lehman or from Lehman to DTC or any of its clearing companies. There was a depository that holds all of the securities. The residential mortgages that you've heard about that were going to be split fifty/fifty are in the DTC registry. We hold them now. They are there. Originally, the idea for the original transaction was to split those fifty/fifty between Barclays and the estate. But in order to facilitate the settlement of these accounts, the additional fifty percent was needed so that DTC would not be at risk for the settlement. So the --

THE COURT: So this modification principally is for the benefit of your client?

MR. HIRSHON: Correct. And for the transaction, because without it trading would have stopped. There would be no business to sell because there would have been no -- no trades cleared today. So it was to facilitate the transaction as a friend to the transaction that this was done so that the business continues to operate today. Now, the arrangement is that the whole six billion dollars of residential mortgages will be there and subject to settlement. But the anticipation is that once all these claims settle, the trades that are from Wednesday through Monday settle, there will not be a need for

all of that collateral. So what the amendment to the APA says is that the fifty percent will be returned, as long as it's there. If something really terrible happens in the world and the settlements don't work and we have to use that collateral, then there will be nothing to return. But the anticipation is that if the world remains somewhat stable that the fifty percent that was now transferred to Barclays will be transferred back to Lehman. That is the expectation.

THE COURT: All right. I appreciate that explanation.

One comment before you continue, Ms. Fife. I'm just once again hearing the Geiger counter. And we are connected to two extra courtrooms and I know that there are people participating at various occasions by telephone through CourtCall. And I'm hearing increased static on the line. So, I'm just going to request everybody who is participating in this hearing, whether by telephone or in person, who has an electronic device to shut it off. And if you're on the phone, since you're just listening, please mute your phone.

MS. FIFE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll continue going through some of the changes, if that's okay. There was a provision in a deal originally which required the debtors to transfer 700 million dollars in cash to Barclays. And that is no longer the case. There's no cash that's being transferred to Barclays.

In addition, there was a provision in the contract where Barclays was going to purchase a company called Eagle Energy Management and they are no longer going to purchase that entity.

We clarified, because a number of creditors had some concerns during the -- yesterday we had a meeting with the creditors and they were asked some questions regarding intercompany claims. We made it very clear in this clarification that we are not transferring any intercompany payables or receivables. Those remain with the particular entities.

There was a reference in the agreement to a mortgage that was on the 745 Seventh Avenue property. And as it turned out, Your Honor, there is no mortgage on that property. So we deleted that reference. There was a 500 million dollar promissory note made by 745 in favor of an affiliate which will be repaid and extinguished.

Those are the major changes to the transaction.

There were some other clarifications that we made but I don't consider them material, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I still consider 500 million dollars material, though.

MS. FIFE: Yes.

THE COURT: So, the money that's due an affiliate, what affiliate is that? And as a result of the payment, how

the telephone who's whispering into the courtroom. As I said at the outset, everybody who is listening on the phone, mute your phone. Everybody who has an electronic device, find it and shut it off or throw it away.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, as I was saying, this afternoon the Securities Investor Protection Corporation initiated a proceeding under the Securities Investor Protection Act in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. Mr. James Giddens, an attorney and experienced SIPC trustee, has been appointed as trustee in the SIPC proceeding. LBI consented to the commencement of the SIPC proceeding. And during the past few days, Mr. Giddens was provided with information concerning the state of affairs at LBI and the need for expedition and support of the sale transaction. Mr. Giddens is a recognized SIPC trustee and a man of great talent, Your Honor. He recognized the extraordinary nature of what is occurring and, unusual for a SIPC proceeding, SIPC and the trustee have agreed that trading in customer accounts --

THE COURT: Sorry. Technical difficulties.

MR. MILLER: In that SIPC proceeding, Your Honor, the trustee and SIPC have agreed that trading in customer accounts may continue in the ordinary course of business rather than be suspended as is usual in a SIPC proceeding. SIPC and the trustee have expended extraordinary efforts in an extraordinary

case to protect the public customers and ensure stability and preservation of customer interests. Their actions are to be commended, Your Honor. And I believe, Your Honor, that the SIPC proceeding has been referred, I hope, to Your Honor.

THE COURT: I've seen Judge Lynch's order. I have a certified copy of it and the order includes a decretal paragraph removing those proceedings to this court. I'm satisfied that the seal is in fact genuine and I'm prepared to proceed with full authority.

MR. MILLER: And, Your Honor, Mr. Giddens is here with Mr. Kevin (sic) Caputo from SIPC and the president of SIPC, Your Honor, Mr. Stephen Harbeck who's sitting in the jury box.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, welcome.

MR. GIDDENS: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. MILLER: Barclays, Your Honor, has extended the sale to enable this extraordinary transaction and hopefully to be consummated. Yesterday, as Your Honor has heard, Barclays basically stepped into the shoes of the Federal Reserve in connection with the Primary Dealer Credit Facility as to the 45.5 billion dollars Lehman borrowed last Monday and received the collateral that Lehman had posted in connection therewith.

Because of the circumstances this week, Your Honor, the operations of LBI have resulted in approximately 300,000 sales, which is very significant. In addition, Your Honor,

because of the administration proceeding in the United Kingdom for LBIE and the freezing of all of the assets of LBI that were in the possession of LBIE, which I believe, Your Honor, stands for Lehman Brothers England, relating to repo financings, the result is that we were unable -- or LBI is unable to deliver to Barclays the assets that were originally intended under the APA. That's one of the reasons, Your Honor, for the amendments that we heard about earlier today.

There are many moving parts in what we are trying to do, many of which are beyond the control of Lehman or Barclays as market forces operate to affect the value of the transaction and the assets. Enormous problems did arise in connection with clearing transactions that have caused a number of modifications to the transaction. The necessity of assuring DTC and other clearing institutions who will not expose themselves to additional liability of some kind has been enormously time consuming.

It's because of that, Your Honor, that we have heard about these changes. But if Your Honor will look at the basic agreement, the amount of cash consideration will be relatively the same except for the issues with respect to the value of the real estate. The 250 million dollars being paid for the goodwill of LBI will go to LBI. The real estate, 745 Seventh Avenue, and the two data centers in New Jersey, that's with a variation, Your Honor, and there's some negotiation to be done

don't know if he or she is in court. But I am, frankly, concerned that we're all hearing -- and maybe others heard it earlier but I'm hearing it only now -- that there is this negative variance in the assumed value of the real estate. And I find that troublesome.

MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. We will try to deal with that, Your Honor. Now, Your Honor, in connection with going forward in the transaction, I don't know what order Your Honor wants to go in, whether you want to hear oral statements of objections or should we move right to the evidentiary hearing?

THE COURT: Well, one of the things I'd like to do, and it's really to verify something, I don't recall seeing an objection from the official creditors' committee. And I don't know, as a result of that, whether the committee supports the transaction, has issues with respect to the transaction or has given you notice of whatever objections they might have. So it seems to me that because of the expedited nature of today's proceeding, we agreed Wednesday that written objections were not necessary and, particularly, not necessary in the case of the committee which had just been formed. I'd like to know what the status is as it relates to that important constituency.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Despins informed me, Your Honor, before the hearing -- I'm losing my voice -- that the committee will not object to the transaction but does not support it. So

they're not affirmatively -- I think not affirmatively going to stand up and say --

MR. DESPINS: Why don't I address that, Your Honor?

MR. MILLER: Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I think that would be helpful.

MR. MILLER: Don't change your position.

MR. DESPINS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Luc Despins with Milbank Tweed, proposed counsel for the committee. I'm here with my partners, Paul Aronson and Dennis Dunne. The headline is we are not objecting, Your Honor, but although we'll have some minor comments to the form of order, which we don't need to detain the court order at this point. And the reason we're not objecting is really based on the lack of a viable alternative. And, Your Honor, we're still a little bit puzzled by the statement by Mr. Miller that we're not affirmatively supporting. And that's correct. We're not affirmatively supporting the transaction, Your Honor, because there has been insufficient time for us to really do all the due diligence that we would feel should be done to take that next step of saying yes, this is the best deal and we're supportive actively. We've met with the debtor. They've been very cooperative. I don't want to imply that they have not been but we have not had time to test the assumptions and do all the due diligence we would normally do. So that is, Your Honor, the distinction.

The second message, Your Honor, which is not directed at Your Honor but really at the debtor and, generally, at also regulators, is that the committee, although we're not objecting to this transaction, we understand we're dealing with extraordinary circumstances, as Your Honor has described. The committee fully expects that after this, we're going to go back to what I would call ---

THE COURT: A more conventional model?

MR. DESPINS: Yes. Business as usual for Chapter 11, if you will, Your Honor. The committee feels very strongly and wanted me to say that they recognize the extraordinary nature of what's going on here but they feel their duties are to prepetition creditors, not to the market participants, not to the economy at large or other participants in those markets. And I think that that's very important and it's very important to the committee that I convey that message, again, not to Your Honor, but really to the debtor and other parties in this case. So that is where we stand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. And it lifts the fog over at least that aspect of the case. And I'm grateful for the comment. Has there been any --

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, we --

THE COURT: Has there been any resolution by agreement of any of the other objections? Or are they all live at this point --

dealer business. The value of the real estate being transferred to Barclays pursuant to the transaction is subject to negotiation with respect of the appraised values. That the building on Seventh Avenue is subject to an appraisal which has been provided to Barclays. And that appraisal is in the area of 900 million dollars to 100 million dollars. And that the appraisal was done by CB Richard Ellis. And it was prepared for the other debtor in this case, LB 745 LLC and Barclays Capital Inc. And it is a voluminous appraisal of the properties which we will offer into evidence at the appropriate time, Your Honor.

And that he would also testify that an appraisal of the two data centers was also directed and that CB Richard Ellis was also engaged to undertake that appraisal. And that appraisal has established the value for the purpose of the negotiations, Your Honor. And as pointed out earlier in the proceeding, those values have come in at slightly less -- I shouldn't say slightly, less than was originally projected.

So that was a very negotiated term, and the reason for the transfer of these properties, Your Honor, is that they are integral to the smooth transition of the businesses.

Barclays will also assume exposure for the employees that accept offers of employment, which is estimated to have a value of approximately -- an exposure of approximately two billion dollars.

Barclays is also assuming the cure amounts relating to contracts and leases that will be assumed pursuant to the asset purchase agreement. And that has a potential exposure, Your Honor, of 1.5 billion dollars that he would testify to.

Barclays is also paying the real estate transfer taxes, which are estimated to be approximately thirty million dollars.

Mr. McDade would testify that the financial community has known that Lehman has been under stress for some time.

Certainly, going back to the time that Bear Sterns was bailed out. Potential purchasers have known that Lehman has been searching for a buyer since well before the Chapter 11 case commenced. And that those ethics, those strategic alternatives that were being pursued involved parts of Lehman as well as the whole of Lehman. And that the notoriety attached to that did not produce any interested parties other than the ones I mentioned -- he mentioned.

During the meeting at the Federal Reserve Bank last week, Bank of America, JPMorgan, Merrill Lynch and Barclays were all present, showing interest in the broker-dealer assets. It was clear to each party that if Lehman was unable to reach a deal it would most likely have to commence cases under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. That would not only have an adverse impact upon their businesses but also upon the international markets.

He would testify that since the commencement of the Chapter 11 case, Lehman's senior management and its advisors have not undertaken an intensive marketing of the business and the assets to be sold. But instead focused on reaching an agreement with the most eligible interested buyer for these assets.

That notwithstanding the lack of a specific program for marketing, the sale of Lehman's broker-dealer business has been known worldwide. And, yet, he would say nobody has expressed an interest to step into the shoes of -- excuse me, step into the shoes of Barclays, Your Honor.

Lehman has not received any other interest since the commencement of the Chapter 11 cases. If Lehman was approached by another potential buyer that he would consider the offer, provided that the company had sufficient liquidity to operate the business without jeopardizing customer accounts. That has not happened, Your Honor. So it is almost academic.

Mr. McDade would testify, Your Honor, that if the sale with Barclays is consummated, customer accounts would continue on a seamless, uninterrupted basis and trading would continue on a normal basis, thereby maintaining the billions of dollars in value.

At the same time, the jobs of thousands of employees would be saved and will be entitled to substantial benefits from Barclays in the form of compensation, bonuses and

- A. The specific question has yet to be determined, given the dynamic nature and speed of which we're operating. Each of the individual businesses will enter into a series of very quick next steps to determine how we actually transact in each of those business units going forward.
- Q. And who will determine which of those contracts go to the purchaser and which of those contracts stay behind? Will that be something in Barclays' discretion, or is that Lehman's decision?
- 10 A. That will be a mutual process.
- Q. And is it your understanding, sir, that all of the
 contracts that are to be negotiated, in terms of whether they
 stay or whether they go, are contracts that reside at LBI? Or
 are any of those contracts that reside at other Lehman
 entities?
- 16 A. LBI.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. And, sir, can you also please confirm if it is your understanding that the purchased assets do not include
 Neuberger Berman or any of its assets?
- 20 A. Yes, I affirm that.
- Q. Okay. Sir, are you aware of whether -- do you know what a closing balance sheet is?
- 23 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. And do you know whether a closing balance sheet was prepared in connection with this transaction?

- A. I am not aware of that.
- Q. Okay. Assuming that one was not, do you have any understanding of why one was not?
- 4 A. The speed of which we're operating.

for the sale of these assets?

- Q. Well, in the absence of a closing balance sheet having
 been prepared, can you please describe for the Court how it is
 that the debtor determined that fair value was being realized
- 9 A. For the assets?
- 10 Q. Yes.

1

8

16

- A. The individual assets on the balance sheet, the trading inventory was bottoms up, meaning individual line item detail processed through all of our individual risk business units in coordination with the normal finance professionals who are incorporated into the valuation process.
 - Q. Did the debtors have any form of valuations of any of the assets that are being transferred?
- 18 | A. Sorry?
- Q. Does Lehman have any valuations -- internal valuations of any of the assets that are being transferred to Barclays?
- A. Absolutely. There are many complex securities involved.

 Many different models that we use to evaluate those securities.
- Q. And so, sir, is it your testimony then that a valuation
 was conducted within Lehman of all of the assets that are being
 transferred to Barclays? When was that conducted?

110 Portfolio moved during the week, but that was conducted all last evening. All through and up to the arrangement -- the agreement today. And, sir, was it the case that at the time of the meeting that took place with creditors this past Wednesday, LBI had approximately --MR. MILLER: Excuse me, Your Honor, Thursday. MR. QURESHI: I apologize, it was Thursday. THE COURT: I'll take that as an objection to the question, and it's sustained. Am I correct, sir, in understanding that at that time creditors were told that LBI had approximately 1.3 billion dollars in cash? That's correct. Okay. And at that time, the deal was that 700 million of those funds would go to Barclays, and the remaining 600 million would stay at LBI? That's correct. And what is the cash balance at LBI today? It's virtually nil. Where did it go? Q. To the CME. Liquidation of the CME trades. And to all the other clearing banks involved in processing of the

Sir, since the time that the agreement was first entered

transactions this week.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

111 into with Barclays early in the week, are you aware of any 1 affirmative efforts of having been undertaken on behalf of 2 3 Lehman to shop these assets to any other potential purchasers? The assets, specifically, the inventory assets? 4 5 The assets being acquired by Barclays or any subset of those? 6 7 No. Nor -- no. MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, may I have one moment, 8 9 please? THE COURT: Sure. 10 Sir, are you familiar, generally, with the terms of the 11 DIP financing agreement? 12 Generally. 13 Okay. Is it your understanding that if the transaction 14 with Barclays does not close, that that would constitute a 15 default under the DIP? 16 Thirty days to repay. It's thirty days to repay. 17 18 So it would trigger a thirty-day repayment of it? 19 A. Yes. Okay. 20 Q. MR. QURESHI: Thank you, Your Honor, that's all I 21 22 have. THE COURT: Is there anyone else who wishes to 23 examine the witness? 24 MR. ROSNER: Your Honor, if you can see me, I'm right 25

126 I was at an afternoon session. My understanding is there 1 2 was more than one session. 3 And these questions were asked as to the intercompany payable, correct? 4 Uh-huh. 5 A. Q. And do you recall whether --6 THE COURT: You have to answer with more than a nod 7 of the head. Thanks. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Sorry. And do you recall whether this information that I'm asking 10 now was given yesterday at the information center? 11 It was not given yesterday. 12 A. 13 Which debtor entity owes that money to LBIE? 14 LBI is a payable to LBIE. And what about Holdings? 15 Q. LBIE is a payable to LB Holdings. 16 And how much is that? 17 Q. Eight billion. A. 18 And do you know what that's derived from? 19 20 Α. No. 21 Did you do an audit of the -- I'm sorry. Has an audit 22 been accomplished of the securities that are to be transferred 23 to Barclays under the proposed transactions?

If you mean an audit by external valuation process?

By identification of the securities?

A.

Q.

24

- 1 A. Absolutely, line by line.
- 2 Q. I think during your proffer it was stated that you are
- familiar with the contract. I assume that means you don't know
- 4 every line but you are generally familiar with the contract
- 5 that's before the Court today, is that a fair statement?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Are you aware of the closing conditions under the
- 8 | contract?
- 9 A. I believe so.
- 10 Q. Are they all satisfied as of today, subject to the entry
- 11 of an order by this Court?
- 12 A. With respect to all those that I have knowledge of, yes.
- 13 Q. And I think there was a question, but I just want to be
- 14 clear. There is a closing condition regarding eight employees
- 15 | signing up agreements, is that correct?
- 16 A. That is correct.
- 17 | Q. And I might have missed this before, and have all of those
- 18 | eight employees been signed up?
- 19 A. We expect no issues with respect to the employment
- 20 services needs to close.
- 21 Q. Okay. So as of sitting here right now, that condition has
- 22 | not been met?
- 23 A. We expect no issues.
- 24 | Q. For the record, it's a yes or no and I just want to make
- 25 | it clear on the record?

either the exact number of those participants or with respect
to Barclays' view as to whether that would be waived if,
indeed, that became an issue.

MR. ROSNER: Okay. I have nothing further, Your
Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else
that wishes to examine Mr. McDade? Come forward. Please state
your name and identity of the client that you're here to
represent.

MR. BYRNE: Yes, Your Honor, good afternoon. Larry
Byrne from Linklaters. Linklaters, Your Honor, represents the
administrators who have been appointed to supervise the
insolvency of four Lehman Brothers entities in the U.K. and in

THE COURT: These are the Pricewaterhouse people?

MR. BYRNE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BYRNE: So we act for Pricewaterhouse who are now the insolvency administrators in the U.K. for these four Lehman Brothers entities who are affiliates of subsidiaries of the debtors.

THE COURT: Okay. You may proceed with your questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

Europe.

- connection with the transactions that did not happen. And then we were re-retained on, I guess, Monday afternoon, after the filing.
- Q. Okay. And, sir, is it correct that you are, again, generally familiar with the terms and the provisions contained in the asset purchase agreement?
- 7 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. And in your proffer the preservation of nine to ten thousand jobs was discussed, correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. And is it your understanding that Barclays' obligation,
 under the terms of the asset purchase agreement, is to only
 keep those employees for ninety days?
 - A. I think, under the terms of the agreement, all nine to ten thousand people will be offered a job for ninety days, and at the end of that period Barclays will decide if they want to offer them full-time employment or not and, if not, they will be given severance according to Lehman's normal severance policy.
 - Q. Okay. With the severance to be paid by whom?
- 21 A. Barclays.
- Q. Okay. So the obligation to employ runs only for ninety days?
- A. I don't know that there's a commitment only for ninety
 days. It's unimaginable to me that they can run the business

- 1 | without people.
- 2 Q. Sir, are you generally familiar with the closing
- 3 conditions contained in the APA?
- 4 A. Generally.
- 5 Q. Okay. And, according to your understanding, as you sit
- 6 here today, have all of the closing conditions been satisfied?
- 7 A. I don't know.
- 8 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any specific closing conditions
- 9 that have not been satisfied?
- 10 A. I don't know.
- 11 | Q. Okay. Are you aware, sir, of the provision in the asset
- 12 | purchase agreement that requires contracts to be negotiated
- 13 | with eight key employees?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Is it your understanding that that is a closing condition?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Is it your understanding that that closing condition has
- 18 been satisfied?
- 19 A. I don't know.
- 20 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that that closing
- 21 | condition has been waived by Barclays?
- 22 A. Not that I know of.
- 23 Q. Okay. Sir, is it also your understanding that one of the
- 24 closing conditions is that, I believe, a prior version of the
- 25 APA used the term "substantial majority" of so-called "critical

150 employees" agreed to go with Barclays upon the closing of the 1 transaction? 2 My understanding: that it's that they don't leave. I 3 don't know that there's an agreement that they go. 4 5 That they are acquired by Barclays, in other words? In other words, they haven't left before the closing. 6 7 Right. And is it your understanding --0. MR. QURESHI: Or, strike that. 8 9 Do you know if that closing condition has been complied with? 10 11 We're closing tonight or we're not closing? Do you have an understanding of whether the substantial 12 13 majority of the employees on that list have agreed to stay upon the closing? 14 That's not the -- they don't leave. It's not that they 15 agreed to stay. And at close of business I saw people working, 16 17 albeit not everybody was at their desk. Sir, in your proffer -- through your proffer you testified 18 19 that Lazard has contacted a number of entities in connection 20 with attempting to find buyers for these assets. Is that correct? 21 22 Can you clarify when? Well, that is going to be my question. Since the 23 24 transaction with Barclays was signed up, has any effort been

made by Lazard to try to find an alternative buyer for the same

			259
1			
2	INDEX, cont'd		•
3			
4	RULINGS		
5	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
6	Debtor's motion for an order confirming status	57	1
7	of Citibank clearing advances approved		
8			
9	Sale transaction approved	245	25
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			ı
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

260 1 2 CERTIFICATION 3 I, Lisa Bar-Leib, certify that the foregoing transcript is a 4 5 true and accurate record of the proceedings. Digitally signed by Lisa Bar-Leib DN: cn=Lisa Bar-Leib, c=US 6 Lisa Bar-Leib Reason: arm the author of this document Date: 2008.09.23 11:37:51 -04'00' 7 LISA BAR-LEIB 8 9 10 Veritext LLC 200 Old Country Road 11 12 Suite 580 13 Mineola, NY 11501 14 15 Date: September 22, 2008 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25